

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17, 20-34 remain in the application.

In response to the Examiner's "Response to Arguments", the Examiner asserts that Meyer teaches a plurality of vision processors, citing the four cameras shown in Fig. 2 of Meyer, and stating that all four cameras can be digital. However, even if all four cameras were digital, a digital camera is NOT a vision system, because a machine vision system requires more than a digital camera to be operative. For example, the images provided by a digital camera must be processed and interpreted. A digital camera merely acquires an image, but does not interpret it. Meyer is silent on any modifications to a standard digital camera that would add the high degree of computational sophistication needed to interpret images. Even if the digital cameras did some image processing, such as contrast enhancement, that still does not rise to the level of image interpretation, and therefore would not classify as "machine vision" as defined in Applicant's specification on page 1.

Regarding the Examiner's citing of the single Visual Basic toolbox as being "at least one user interface being on a UI computing platform", the claims have been amended to require "a least one machine vision user interface (UI) being on a machine vision UI computing platform". Thus, since the single Visual

Basic toolbox interface is not a machine vision user interface, the claim no longer reads thereon.

Since there are not a plurality of VPs in Meyer, as explained above regarding the fact that a digital camera is not sufficient to be considered a VP, then Applicant's argument regarding Meyer failing to teach a link function due to the fact that the Meyer reference only discloses one VP is still valid, and therefore is still asserted.

Van Dort teaches a system for equipment control, comprising a common communications channel. Van Dort never mentions machine vision systems, or vision processors (VPs). Although Van Dort does mention an "actuator", Van Dort also reveals that each type of equipment that communicates over the channel also acts as an actuator: "Equipment units and actuator units are not mutually exclusive in the system the actuator and equipment units are treated as equivalent." See col. 5, lines 65-67, and col. 6, lines 1-9. Thus, Van Dort teaches away from Applicant's invention, where there must be distinct VPs and a distinct machine vision UI, each on a respective distinct platform.

Further, Van Dort teaches that "the equipment units to which a message is transferred will change their state in a way contained in or implied by the message". Notice that this language says **NOTHING** about issuing "instructions from the first VP to the machine vision UI to establish communication with the

any second VP", as required by amended claim 1, for example. Van Dort does NOT teach what is now claimed by Applicant, in whole or in part.

Therefore, Van Dort does not make up the deficiency in Meyer, and so combining Meyer and Van Dort does NOT result in Applicant's invention. This is because Meyer is architecturally flawed, and Van Dort is also architecturally flawed in the same way. Both Meyer and Van Dort do not teach a first and second distinct VP on respective VP platforms that interact with a machine vision UI on a distinct machine vision UI platform, as now required by all the amended claims. Also, Meyer does NOT teach a plurality of vision processors. Van Dort also does not teach a plurality of vision processors, or even one vision processor. Combining these references does not result in anything even resembling Applicant's invention. Importantly, there is also NO suggestion or motivation to combine these references. The Examiner's points of disagreement are deemed to be overcome.

Similarly, the rejection of claims 20, 26, and 30 is deemed to be overcome, for the reasons set forth above.

Appl. No. 09/873,163
Amdt. dated December 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of 08/22/2005

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to phone the undersigned attorney to further the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12/22/05



Russ Weinzimmer
Registration No. 36,717
Attorney for Applicants

P.O. Box 862
Wilton, NH 03086

Phone: 603-654-5670
Fax: 603-654-3556